

I have to hand it to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Oregon, a fine, fair chairman who has done the best he can under very difficult circumstances.

There is no excuse for these bills not having passed. But I think it was part of a contrived program, established by the leaders in the House. I do not make this up. Why were these annual appropriations bills not passed on time? Because stuck inside most of these bills are controversial legislative proposals that otherwise would not be passed. Abortion, in many of the appropriations bills, has simply drawn them to a grinding halt.

Wiping out environmental protection—one bill had 17 environmental riders to, in effect, wipe out the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect clean air, clean water. They stuck in things like grazing.

I am a western Senator and I have fought the good fight on grazing for many years. There is a time and a place for grazing. It should be in authorizing legislation, not on appropriations bills. The same as mining, same as drilling in ANWR, same as clear-cutting of trees in various parts of this country. Why do we not do these in the ordinary, regular procession of authorizing regulation? Why in appropriations bills?

Many of these appropriations bills read more like legislative wish lists. The majority knew these bills must be signed into law to keep the Government operating, and they viewed these bills from a gambler's perspective. They gambled, notwithstanding controversial legislation that they could not get passed in the ordinary process, that the President would sign them anyway.

They were wrong. Even if the President refused and the Government were to shut down, they would use the shutdown as a weapon, and that is what they have done. They would force the President to sign legislation that the majority of the American public opposed for the sake of keeping the Government operating. This was apparent as far back as April.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised, at his request he was to be reminded when he had 1 minute remaining.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to have 4 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. In April, House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH vowed to create a titanic standoff for President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to must-pass legislation increasing the national debt. This was reported in a number of places, including the Washington Times, on April 30. He boasted that "the President will veto a number of things and we will put them all in the debt ceiling, and then he will decide how big of a crisis he wants." Again, this is a quote from Speaker GINGRICH.

We learned, a couple of days ago, why the Speaker is allowing this standoff to continue and why, even from his own perspective, it is tougher than it would have been ordinarily. Do you know why? Because he had to leave Air Force One from a door that he did not feel was appropriate, and the President did not spend enough time with him on the airplane. This is going to the funeral of an assassinated Prime Minister of the State of Israel.

In the Washington Post, the Speaker is quoted as saying, because the President did not speak with him on the flight to Israel for Prime Minister Rabin's funeral, "that is part of the reason why you ended up with us sending down a tougher interim spending bill." The Speaker is also quoted as saying, "It is petty, but I think it is human."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not human; it is just plain petty.

Let us talk about some facts. Fact No. 1: Speaker GINGRICH said, as early as April, that a Government shutdown and default were political tools he was likely to use as a lever to push his extreme agenda. That is a fact.

Fact No. 2: There are 12 appropriations bills necessary to fund the Government. Since this Government has been in session starting last January, the majority has simply failed to do this, and that is why we have the crisis we have today.

Fact: President Clinton favored a balanced budget and is fighting for one. The fight is over how to get there. The Republicans want to do it on the backs of seniors, the poor, students, and ordinary citizens. The Republicans want to do it in their own way.

We have now an economy that is great. We have the lowest inflation, the lowest unemployment in 50 years. We have the third year in a row where we have had declining deficits—certainly not enough, but the third year in a row for the first time in 50 years. We have 175,000 fewer Federal employees than we had 2½ years ago, the highest economic growth since the days of Johnson, the highest corporate profits in the history of the country. Why? Because the Democrats, a couple of years ago, passed a budget that cut \$500 billion from the deficit. That is why the economy is so good.

Do you know we did not get a single Republican to vote with us? The Vice President had to come and break the tie.

Fact: Recent polling shows Americans do not want the extreme agenda pushed by the radical right in the GOP. That is why the Speaker is using the Government shutdown and the threat of default as a way to blackmail this Congress and this President.

Final fact: Since the Republicans cannot pass their ideologically extreme agenda through normal legislative channels, they are trying to force the President to agree to their demands to shut the Government down. That is not how the system should work.

Mr. President, the crisis has been planned by Professor GINGRICH. He knows how crises develop. He has studied it. We have one here. It is all of his own doing, and I say, people of good will, both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, should stand up and say that is not the way to run a government.

Legislation is the art of compromise, and we should work this out. We all agree on a balanced budget. It is a question of priorities. Let us fight out the priorities on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House the way we have done it for 200 years.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am requested by the leadership to ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, those of the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], and those of the distinguished Democratic leader, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, about 3 days ago when we began to debate a continuing resolution which would have caused the Government to go back to work while we attempted to reach a balanced budget, the leading member of the Democratic Party on the Budget Committee, the Senator from Nebraska, pleaded with us for what he called—and I quote him—a "simple extension."

Mr. President, this standoff is taking place because—between a "simple extension" and the dramatic change represented by the formal 7-year budget passed by this body 2 nights ago that would balance the budget by the year 2002—there is a great gulf fixed. This is not a petty difference. This is not a minor difference in opinion on a slight change in direction for the Government of the United States. It is reflected in what the majority leader said if that bill passed. That profound difference was reflected by the remarks of the majority leader to the effect that the vote that he cast to cause the budget to be balanced was probably the most important that he had cast in all of his many years in the U.S. Senate.

We on this side of the aisle wish to end the practice of spending \$200 billion a year on programs which we like and support eloquently but refuse to pay for and, therefore, send the bills to our children and grandchildren. Members on the other side wish for a simple extension of the present course of action. They argue eloquently for the status

quo. They like what Government is doing at the present time, and they are quite content to spend money and send the bills to someone else in some future generation.

We have been informed that, if we do in fact pass a set of laws that will balance the budget by the year 2002, the Federal Government itself will receive a dividend of \$170 billion in lower interest rates on the debt and in higher tax collections because people are making higher incomes. The dividends to the people of the United States is some half a trillion dollars in lower interest rates on their homes, their automobiles, in better job opportunities, and in higher wages. We look to the future. They look to the present and to the past.

The President now in the present negotiations is willing to set a goal of a balanced budget, a dream of a balanced budget, the thought that the budget might be balanced sometime long after he ceases to be President, but he is unwilling to state it as a policy.

Even if we are to go to a balanced budget, there is another struggle which is not at all petty, Mr. President, between whose figures we will use, those of the Congressional Budget Office, the very Congressional Budget Office which the President himself said was the neutral arbiter just 2 years ago, and the figures that the President himself through his own office comes up with to suit his own purposes.

Many, including some otherwise thoughtful commentators on national television, say, "This is \$1 million difference. Why are you quarreling over it?" Mr. President, we are quarreling over it because the difference in those estimates in the next 10 years is \$1 trillion in spending. This President wants to use estimates that will allow him to spend \$1 trillion more in the next 10 years, half a trillion dollars more in the next 7 years, the 7 which separate us in the debate on the balanced budget. That is not a modest difference, Mr. President—half a trillion dollars in the next 7 years.

What is the difference given the fact that neither side can be certain that it is right? If the White House is wrong and the Congressional Budget Office is right, and we adopt the White House figures, we will never have deficits lower than \$150 billion or \$200 billion even at the end of the 7 years. If, on the other hand, we are wrong, we are too conservative and they are right but our policies are adopted, what happens then? We balance the budget in 5 years rather than 7. We simply reach our goal more rapidly with a larger fiscal dividend.

Let us put it very straightforward. Two days ago this Congress passed a continuing resolution, one which would have put all Government employees back to work with the single requirement that we state that we would come up with a budget that would be balanced by the year 2002 using the honest and realistic figures of the Congress-

sional Budget Office. It did not confine the President or the other party to any particular tax cut, to any particular defense budget, or to any particular reductions or slowing of growth in any program at all. It simply said that we would debate from the same set of figures, and we would reach the same desired end. That is all.

So this is an important difference. If you want to spend another half a trillion dollars in the course of the next 7 years, you should favor the President's course of action. That is what he wants to do. That is his budget. If you feel that it is immoral, as well as economically wrong, to spend money today and to bill your children and grandchildren for it, and you can accomplish those goals while still allowing spending in the U.S. Government to go up by an average of 3 percent a year, then you take our side of this debate, Mr. President.

The debate is an important one. It is a vital one. It is, as the majority leader said, at least the single most important debate in the last 10 years, if not longer. It is a debate between those who believe that the budget ought in fact to be in balance at the end of 7 years and those who have other and higher priorities and want to continue to spend money that they do not put up themselves but that they will bill to their children and their grandchildren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair, Mr. President.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak this afternoon as one of the seven Democrats who voted for the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 122, which passed the Senate on Friday.

Essentially, as has been stated, this resolution provided what we have all wanted, a clean continuing resolution. In its third title, it said the Congress and the President, "shall enact a balanced budget by the year 2002 which is balanced." I believe a balanced budget is something that a majority of this body supports—perhaps it draws more support on your side of the aisle, Mr. President, than on our side, but a balanced budget draws support from our side of the aisle as well.

It is my understanding this continuing resolution has not yet gone to the President—in fact, that it is still in the enrolling clerk's office of the Senate. It is my hope that this resolution would go to the President for his signature. I would like to take a few minutes and explain why I think it is important that he do the statesmanlike thing, and sign this resolution, put Government back to work, call the parties together, and begin to negotiate on what is really the heart of the debate—the reconciliation bill.

As long as we keep Government shut down over the absence of a continuing

resolution, essentially all we are doing is talking about the size and shape of the table.

Now, there are those who would say, oh, that is not correct because, inherent in the continuing resolution is a very important point. The Congressional Budget Office provides the economic and technical data which enables one to judge the revenues with which one would be able to balance the budget. In fact, many people believe that regardless of whether you use the Office of Management and Budget or the Congressional Budget Office estimates, both will in fact be off and perhaps by some significant amount. The differences could translate into billions of dollars, so it is a significant issue.

But we have to keep our eyes focused on the economy. I know in California, for the first time in several years, revenues have begun to move ahead, some \$700 million, ahead of estimates in this quarter of the year for the State of California. That is a good omen. It means that perhaps the economy will move ahead at a higher level than has been anticipated. The CBO's estimates then could be amended.

For me, it is not a big difference because I think the economic projections will be amended, and they will be figured into the base of the future years as we move along. But I think what is important is that we put an end to what is taking place now because it has gone on now for 5 days and is in fact beginning to hurt people. There are small businesses in my State that are contractors with the EPA or with Defense that are now laying off employees. There are 60,000 Head Start youngsters that now may not be able to attend school.

I listened to Senator STEVENS quite eloquently outline on the floor of this body yesterday afternoon the impact that this shutdown is beginning to have on the military. He pointed out that in just a matter of a week, there will be no fuel. He pointed out that already people beginning to move on military leave to go home for Thanksgiving are being stopped; that there is no money being paid for many kinds of duties that the military must carry out.

We know what is happening with our national parks. The Senator from Arizona very eloquently stated the conditions at the Grand Canyon. At Yosemite National Park, I can tell you that \$22,000 a day is unable to be taken in because it is closed.

We know that the Securities and Exchange Commission is unable to collect higher filing fees for stocks and bonds because we have no appropriation bill in place, and that has cost United States taxpayers about \$10 million on the first day of this stalemate.

Then there are the hundreds of thousands of employees that have their house payments, their car payments and additional real facts of life that they have to be able to carry out to exist. This dispute has gone on long